



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,454	05/30/2000	Nobuhiro Ono	192432USRD	2458

7590

06/01/2004

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,454

Applicant(s)

ONO ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 03/08/2004, has been entered. Claims 1-14 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, U.S. patent No. 5,649,218, Aoyama et al. (Aoyama), U.S. Patent No. 6,526,410, and further in view of DeRose et al. (DeRose), U.S. Patent No. 5,983,248.

4. As to claims 1 and 10, Saito discloses a document editing system for editing a document in a computer, comprising:

means for discriminating a specified plurality of document areas within an arbitrary area of the document and managing the specified plurality of document areas

Art Unit: 2176

along with attributes assigned thereto (col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 8, col. 9, lines 36-54 and col. 13, lines 40-56: data in the document is discriminated by tags in order to represent its structure);

means for managing generation and deletion of a tag pair including a start tag and an end tag (col. 9, lines 36-54: structure restoring section 13 restores omitted tags (deleted tags));

However, Saito does not disclose document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. In the similar field of endeavor, Aoyama discloses a document editing program 104 for editing document (col. 6, lines 40-57), and the document editing program 104 edits structured documents such as tags or anchors (character sequence) and some parts of the body of the document in Fig. 5A are retained, and other parts are updated in Fig. 5B (Figs. 5A & 5B). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Saito and Aoyama to include document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. Aoyama also provides a method for managing the editing of a structured document for a document processing system capable of managing the editing on the basis of comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents.

However, Saito and Aoyama do not explicitly disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a

unique identifier attached to each other tag pair. DeRose discloses each element in an electronic document is assigned a type name according to its markup, and a start tag is applied to each element before any of that elements child elements are visited, and an end tag is applied to each element after its child elements are visited (col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 16). DeRose also discloses the representation of the document further includes unique element identifiers assigned to each element in the document (col. 4, lines 47-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of DeRose and Saito and Aoyama to include a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair in order to enable a user to navigate the document readily and to find as much as possible its relevant portions and also allow user quick access to document elements.

5. As to claims 2 and 11, Saito and Aoyama and DeRose (Saito-Aoyama-DeRose) disclose wherein said plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of types of document areas (Saito, col. 6, lines 5-20).

6. As to claims 3 and 12, Saito-Aoyama-DeRose disclose linking at least one linked document to the specified plurality of document areas and passing information about the link to said means for discriminating and managing (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65); and

first means for outputting the at least one linked document linked by said link
means for linking at least one linked document, by reference to information about the
specified document areas (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

7. As to claims 4 and 13, Saito-Aoyama-DeRose disclose wherein said specified
plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of document areas specified within the
entirety of the document or arbitrary portions thereof (Saito, Fig. 14), and

wherein said document editing system further comprises:

means for managing an arbitrary display format assigned to the specified plurality
of document areas (Saito, col. 7, lines 24-34); and

second means for outputting the document managed in the arbitrary expression
format provided in said display format (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

8. As to claims 5 and 4, Saito-Aoyama-DeRose disclose means for linking an
arbitrary process to the specified plurality of document areas, wherein a trigger to
execute the arbitrary process is set for the specified plurality of document areas, and
information about the link to the arbitrary process is passed to said means for
discriminating and managing (Saito, Fig. 2); and

means for storing the link to the arbitrary process (Saito, col. 7, lines 2-34).

9. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Takahashi et al. (Takahashi), U.S. Patent No. 6,535,875, Ferrel et al. (Ferrel), U.S.

Patent No. 6,230,173, and further in view of DeRose et al. (DeRose), U.S. Patent No. 5,983,248.

10. As to claim 6, Takahashi discloses a method of preparing a tag information management table for editing a document, said method comprising the steps of:

determining whether or not an arbitrary character string within the document is selected (col. 27, lines 9-36);

acquiring tag information pieces, including a kind of tag pair assigned to a document area and a position of a start tag and a position of an end tag, if it is determined in said determining that the arbitrary character string is selected (col. 13, lines 5-25);

However, Takahashi does not disclose assigning a nonoverlapping unique tag ID to the tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing a link between the nonoverlapping unique tag ID and the tag information pieces in the tag information management table. In the same field of endeavor, Ferrel discloses a tag ID number is generated and put in a Tag ID Lookup Table when the content is linked to a control by the designer, and each tag is converted to a numerical description during the link, and therefore, the tag ID of the node is a number corresponding to a particular tag (col. 33, line 64 – col. 34, line 15 and Fig. 17). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Takahashi and Ferrel to include assigning nonoverlapping tag IDs to the respective tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing into a tag information

management table for use in editing a document, a link between the tag IDs assigned to the tags in said assigning step and the tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step. Ferrel suggests that efficiently transmitting tagged content to a computer in an on-line publishing system to provide content providers with increased flexibility for presenting their content to customers.

However, Takahashi and Ferrel do not explicitly disclose each tag ID is unique. DeRose discloses each element in an electronic document is assigned a type name according to its markup, and a start tag is applied to each element before any of that elements child elements are visited, and an end tag is applied to each element after its child elements are visited (col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 16). DeRose also discloses the representation of the document further includes unique element identifiers assigned to each element in the document (col. 4, lines 47-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of DeRose and Takahashi and Ferrel to include a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair in order to enable a user to navigate the document readily and to find as much as possible its relevant portions and also allow user quick access to document elements.

11. Claims 7-9 have similar limitations as claim 6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(A) Prior arts do not teach or suggest a tag management means that includes start tags and end tags having a unique identifier that is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair.

As to point (A), Saito and Aoyama disclose the limitations as discussed in claim 1. However, Saito and Aoyama do not explicitly disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair. DeRose discloses each element in an electronic document is assigned a type name according to its markup, and a start tag is applied to each element before any of that elements child elements are visited, and an end tag is applied to each element after its child elements are visited (col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 16). DeRose also discloses the representation of the document further includes unique element identifiers assigned to each element in the document (col. 4, lines 47-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of DeRose and Saito and Aoyama to include a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair in order to enable a user to navigate the document readily and to find as much

Art Unit: 2176

as possible its relevant portions and also allow user quick access to document elements.

12. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 03/08/2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 6-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is different from a unique identifier attached to each other tag pair) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The examiner can normally be reached at 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3230.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20131

Or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for **formal communications**; please mark
"EXPEDITE PROCEDURE").

Or:


(703) 746-7240 (for **informal or draft communications**, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for **After Final Communications**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER